The Vainshtein mechanism as a duality of the particle creation process of black-holes

Ivan Arraut
Department of Physics, Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan

Abstract

I explain the origin of the Vainshtein mechanism in terms of the "gauge" transformation function $T_0(r,t)$ for the stationary spherically-symmetric solutions obtained in *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. 023E02, (2014)*, where the extra degrees of freedom enter through the spatial dependence of the gauge transformation function $T_0(r,t) \backsim t + A(r)$. Written in this form, the Vainshtein mechanism is a way to recover the Birkhoff theorem for scales near the source and the Cosmic no-hair conjecture for scales near the cosmological horizon. Additionally, the Vainshtein mechanism is the dual version of the particle creation process in a black-Hole (radiation). Then if we want to analyze the Hawking radiation inside dRGT, we have to be careful when some apparent extra contribution appears. This extra contribution comes from the dual version of the Vainshtein mechanism, behaving as a particle creation process from the point of view of an observer located at scales $r >> r_V$, with r_V being the Vainshtein scale.

PACS numbers:

arXiv:1407.7796v2 [gr-qc] 30 Jul 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

The Vainshtein mechanism was originally proposed by Vainshtein [1] in order to explain how the non-linearities inside massive gravity are able to recover the predictions of General Relativity (GR) near the gravitational sources. The linear version of massive gravity is excluded at the solar system scale due to the extra contribution coming from the coupling between the scalar component and the trace of the energy-momentum tensor [2, 3]. The Vainshtein mechanism operates through the Galileon structure of the scalar components, where the strong coupling scale appears [4]. The usual explanation goes to the decoupling limit of the theory where the vectorial component can be ignored since it remains free [3, 5]. In this way, the Vainshtein mechanism in dRGT appears as a consequence of the non-linearities of the theory, able to screen the effect of the scalar component at scales satisfying $r << r_V$. For scales satisfying $r >> r_V$, the theory is at the linear regime and then the extra-degrees of freedom play an important role. The Vainshtein scale r_V, appears as the distance where the scalar component and the tensorial one, are equally important. In a previous manuscript, the author demonstrated that the Vainshtein scale also appears as a extremal condition of the dynamical metric when all the degrees of freedom of the theory are inside it [6]. Written in this form, the dynamical metric becomes invariant under diffeomorphism transformations [3]. By using this point of view, the Vainshtein conditions could be derived [6]. The Vainshtein conditions are general in the sense that they allow us to calculate the Vainshtein scale for dynamically evolving systems. The non-linearities of the theory appear implicitly through the source terms coming from the dynamical metric ($f(r)$). In this manuscript, I demonstrate that the Galileon structure related to the equations of motion of the scalar component in dRGT, appear through the $r-r$ component of the Vainshtein conditions previously derived in [6]. The other conditions are complements of this one. I go further and I explain how the Vainshtein mechanism can be seen as a way to recover the Birkhoff theorem for scales satisfying $r << r_V$ and how the Vainshtein mechanism under the same principles can be seen as a proof of the Cosmic-no hair conjecture when the cosmological constant is included [7]. Additionally, I demonstrate how the Vainshtein mechanism can be seen as a duality of the particle creation process, able to create an apparent extra-radiation component for observers at scales $r >> r_V$ when the Hawking radiation is under study. This extra component comes from the phase-shift generated from the contributions of the extra-degrees of freedom, which is traduced in extra-particle production inside the Bogolubov coefficients unless the asymptotic observers are described with respect extended notions of Killing vectors. This is related to the functional degeneracy analyzed in [8]. The paper is organized as follows: In Section (II), I introduce the usual explanation of the Vainshtein mechanism for the cubic Galileon. In Section (III), I review the usual explanation of the Vainshtein mechanism in dRGT at the decoupling limit. In Section (IV), I make a review of the two points of view for understanding the role of the extra-degrees of freedom in massive gravity: The first one is with all the degrees of freedom inside the dynamical metric. In such a case, it becomes invariant under diffeomorphism transformations. The second one, is with all the degrees of freedom inside the fiducial metric. Both points of view are equivalent. In Section (V), I introduce the Schwarzschild de-Sitter (S-dS) solution, obtained originally in [8]. In Section (VI), I explain the origin of the Vainshtein conditions and its relation with the Galileon structure. In Section (VII), I make a brief explanation about the relation between the Vainshtein mechanism and the Birkhoff theorem, which is not valid in general in dRGT. In the same section, I describe how the Vainshtein mechanism is the responsible

for the Cosmic no-hair conjecture when the cosmological constant (Λ) is included, such that a cosmological horizon appears. In Section (VIII), I demonstrate that the Vainshtein mechanism is a duality with respect to the particle creation process of a black-hole. In this sense, particles would appear for an observer located at distances satisfying $r >> r_V$ unless the observer is defined with respect an extended notion of Killing vector in the direction of the "gauge" function $T_0(r,t)$. Although this observer might describe extra particles coming from the black-hole, in reality they correspond to the extra-degrees of freedom becoming relevant at such scales. On the other hand, some observers located at scales $r << r_V$ or even near, must be able to obtain the appropriate value of the black-hole particle production process. This is analogous to what happens in the standard S-dS space in GR, where the static observer, able to describe the appropriate value of temperature is the observer located at $r = r_0 = (3GMr_\Lambda^2)^{1/3}$. In a previous manuscript, the author explained that this scale and r_V are connected through the Vainshtein conditions [6]. Finally in Section (IX), I conclude.

II. THE VAINSHTEIN MECHANISM: STANDARD EXPLANATION

The Vainshtein mechanism is usually introduced as a mechanism able to recover GR at scales near the gravitational source [1]. The mechanism operates through the non-linearities of the theory, able to screen the additional attractive effect of the scalar degree of freedom. In a previous manuscript, the author demonstrated that the Vainshtein radius corresponds to the extremal condition for the dynamical metric in unitary gauge [6]. The Vainshtein mechanism then appeared as the vanishing of the spatial derivative of the gauge transformation function $T_0(r,t)$. This is just approximate since in reality the derivative is negligible rather than zero. In the usual notion of Vainshtein mechanism, the helicity-zero component of the Stückelberg fields, represented by π, behaves as a scalar field in some limit; obeying the following symmetry [3, 4]:

$$\pi \to \pi + c + v_\mu x^\mu. \tag{1}$$

The general galileon action takes the form:

$$\pounds = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial\pi)^2 - \frac{1}{\Lambda^3}(\partial\pi)^2\Box\pi + \frac{1}{M_{pl}}\pi T, \tag{2}$$

where T is the trace of the energy-momentum tensor and Λ is the strong coupling of the theory. In the decoupling limit of massive gravity, the massive action contains similar terms with respect to the previous expression. If we assume a static and spherically symmetry source, then we can define:

$$T = -M\frac{\delta(r)}{4\pi r^2}, \tag{3}$$

where M is the mass of the source. For a static and spherically symmetric source, it is reasonable to assume that the helicity-0 components of the Stückelberg fields become of the form $\pi = \pi(r)$. In such a case, the field equation for the Lagrangian (2) becomes:

$$\frac{1}{r^2}\partial_r\left(r^3\left(\frac{\pi_0'(r)}{r} + \frac{1}{\Lambda^3}\left(\frac{\pi_0'}{r}\right)^2\right)\right) = \frac{M}{4\pi M_{pl}}\frac{\delta(r)}{r^2}. \tag{4}$$

By integrating both sides with respect to r, we get the following result:

$$\frac{\pi_0'}{r}+\frac{1}{\Lambda^3}\left(\frac{\pi_0'}{r}\right)^2=\frac{M}{4\pi M_{pl}r^3}. \tag{5}$$

From this previous expression, we can observe that for large scales, the second term on the left-hand side becomes negligible. In such a case, the linear term dominates. On the other hand, for short scales we have the opposite behavior, namely, the non-linear term becomes dominant. Then there must be a distance where both contributions become equivalent. There are two ways for deriving such scale. The first one is by just saying that the linear contribution has to be of the same order of magnitude as the non-linear one for some scale r_* for the expression (5). In such a case, we have:

$$\frac{\pi_0'}{r}\backsim\frac{M}{M_{pl}r^3}\backsim\frac{(\pi_0')^2}{\Lambda^3 r^2}. \tag{6}$$

If we solve this system of equations, we get:

$$r_*\backsim\frac{1}{\Lambda}\left(\frac{M}{M_{pl}}\right)^{1/3}, \tag{7}$$

which corresponds to the Vainshtein scale [3, 4]. At this scale, the, the helicity-0 component $\pi(r)$, can take one of the following values:

$$\pi_0'\backsim\Lambda^3 r, \qquad \pi_0'=0. \tag{8}$$

On the other hand, the other way for deriving the same scale is by taking the spatial derivative on the left-hand side of (5) and then sending the result to zero. Then we obtain:

$$(\pi_0')^2-(2\pi_0''r)\pi_0'-r^2\Lambda^3\pi_0''=0. \tag{9}$$

The previous equation provides two possible solutions. They are given by:

$$\pi_0'=\pi_0''r\left(1\pm\sqrt{1+\frac{\Lambda^3}{\pi_0''}}\right). \tag{10}$$

For consistency, it is necessary to get a single solution. This only happens when $\pi_0''=-\Lambda^3$. then we get:

$$|\pi_0'|=\Lambda^3 r, \tag{11}$$

which is just the same result obtained in eq. (8). It can be verified that for this previous condition, the linear and non-linear contributions in eq. (45) have equal contributions for the final result. By replacing the magnitude eq. (11), then we get:

$$r_*=\frac{1}{2\Lambda}\left(\frac{M}{\pi M_{pl}}\right)^{1/3}, \tag{12}$$

which is just the Vainshtein scale.

III. DECOUPLING LIMIT IN MASSIVE GRAVITY AND THE VAINSHTEIN MECHANISM

The usual explanation for the Vainshtein mechanism, can be found in [1]. In most of the cases, the analysis is simpler if we work in the decoupling limit of the theory, where the unimportant interactions are ignored. Only scales at energies below the strong coupling scale survive in this limit [1]. In the standard formalism of the dRGT theory, the action is given by [8, 9]:

$$S = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}(R + m^2U(g,\phi)), \tag{13}$$

with the effective potential depending on two free parameters as:

$$U(g,\phi) = U_2 + \alpha_3 U_3 + \alpha_4 U_4, \tag{14}$$

where:

$$U_2 = Q^2 - Q_2, \tag{15}$$

$$U_3 = Q^3 - 3QQ_2 + 2Q_3, \tag{16}$$

$$U_4 = Q^4 - 6Q^2Q_2 + 8QQ_3 + 3Q_2^2 - 6Q_4, \tag{17}$$

$$Q = Q_1, \qquad Q_n = Tr(Q^n)^{\mu}{}_{\nu}, \tag{18}$$

$$Q^{\mu}{}_{\nu} = \delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu} - M^{\mu}{}_{\nu}, \tag{19}$$

$$(M^2)^{\mu}{}_{\nu} = g^{\mu\alpha}f_{\alpha\nu}, \tag{20}$$

$$f_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{ab}\partial_\mu\phi^a\partial_\nu\phi^b. \tag{21}$$

We can the compute the field equations as follows:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = -m^2X_{\mu\nu}, \tag{22}$$

where:

$$X_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\delta U}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} - \frac{1}{2}Ug_{\mu\nu}. \tag{23}$$

Here $f_{\mu\nu}$ is the fiducial metric and Q is the trace of the matrix $Q^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$. The potential (U) defined above is unique. It is impossible to add polynomial terms without introducing a ghost [9, 10]. Here I will proceed to study the decoupling limit of the theory. For that purpose, it is necessary to define:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + \frac{h_{\mu\nu}}{M_{pl}} = H_{\mu\nu} + \eta_{ab}\partial_\mu\phi^a\partial_\nu\phi^b, \tag{24}$$

where $a, b = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $\eta_{ab} = diag(-1, 1, 1, 1)$. $H_{\mu\nu}$ behaves as a tensor if the fields ϕ^a transform as scalars under a change of coordinates. The definition (24) gives the form for the covariantization of the perturbation $h_{\mu\nu}$. The purpose is to restore the gauge invariance by introducing redundant variables. If we define

$$Y^a = (x^\alpha - \pi^\alpha)\delta^a{}_\alpha, \tag{25}$$

then we get:

$$H_{\mu\nu} = \frac{h_{\mu\nu}}{M_{pl}} + \partial_\mu\pi_\nu + \partial_\nu\pi_\mu - \eta_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\mu\pi^\alpha\partial_\nu\pi^\beta. \tag{26}$$

The index for π^μ is raised or lowered by using the Minkowskian metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$. If we use the substitution $\pi_\alpha = \partial_\alpha\pi/\Lambda_3^3 = \partial_\alpha\pi/(m^2 M_{pl})$ with the effective field scale Λ_3, then we get:

$$H_{\mu\nu} = \frac{h_{\mu\nu}}{M_{pl}} + \frac{2}{M_{pl}m^2}\Pi_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{M_{pl}^2 m^4}\Pi_{\mu\nu}^2, \tag{27}$$

where $\Pi_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\partial_\nu\pi$ and $\Pi_{\mu\nu}^2 = \eta^{\alpha\beta}\Pi_{\mu\alpha}\Pi_{\beta\nu}$. The traces are defined as $[\Pi^2] = \Pi^{\mu\nu}\Pi_{\mu\nu}$ and $[\Pi]^2 = \Pi^\mu{}_\mu\Pi^\nu{}_\nu$. By using the definition (19), we get:

$$Q_{\mu\nu}(g, H)_{h_{\mu\nu}=0} = \frac{\Pi_{\mu\nu}}{M_{pl}m^2}. \tag{28}$$

This is obtained if we take into account that $H_{\mu\nu h=0} = \frac{2}{M_{pl}m^2}\Pi_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{M_{pl}^2 m^4}\Pi_{\mu\nu}^2$ from eq. (24) and then replacing it inside eq. (19). The decoupling limit of the theory is defined as:

$$m \to 0, \qquad M_{pl} \to \infty, \qquad with \quad \Lambda_3 \equiv (m^2 M_{pl})^{1/3} \quad fixed. \tag{29}$$

At this limit, the action (13), up to total derivatives, is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} \pounds = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{h}_{\mu\nu}\hat{\varepsilon}^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} + \frac{3}{2}\pi\Box\pi + \frac{3}{2}\frac{(6c_3-1)}{\Lambda_3^3}(\partial\pi)^2\Box\pi + \\ \frac{1}{\Lambda_3^6}\left(\frac{1}{2}(6c_3-1)^2 - 2(c_3+8d_5)\right)(\partial\pi)^2\left([\Pi^2]-[\Pi]^2\right) + \frac{1}{\Lambda_3^6}\hat{h}^{\mu\nu}X_{\mu\nu}^{(3)} \\ -\frac{5}{2\Lambda_3^9}(6c_3-1)(c_3+8d_5)(\partial\pi)^2\left([\Pi]^3 - 3[\Pi][\Pi]^2 + 2[\Pi^3]\right). \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

This action is obtained after diagonalizing the original one at the decoupling limit with the local transformation:

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \hat{h}_{\mu\nu} + Z_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} + \frac{Z_{\mu\nu}^{(2)}}{\Lambda_3^3}, \tag{31}$$

where $Z_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} = \eta_{\mu\nu}\pi$ and $Z_{\mu\nu}^{(2)} = (6c_3-1)\partial_\mu\pi\partial_\nu\pi$. The Lagrangian (30), has the Galileon structure; as a consequence, the Vainshtein mechanism will appear in the same way as in the case explained in the previous section [3, 4, 9].

IV. THE STÜCKELBERG TRICK: THE TWO POINTS OF VIEW

A. Stückelberg fields appearing in the dynamical metric

The Stückelberg trick as has been formulated for massive gravity, allows us to work under two different points of view. The first one corresponds to the introduction of the extra-degrees of freedom inside the dynamical metric. In such a case, the Stückelberg fields enter through the metric as [3]:

$$g_{\mu\nu} \to G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial Y^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\frac{\partial Y^\beta}{\partial x^\nu} g_{\alpha\beta}(Y(x)), \tag{32}$$

where the symbols Y^α represent the Stückelberg contribution. The previous equation looks like a standard gauge transformation in GR. However, it represents in reality the introduction of redundant variables in order to restore the diffeomorphism invariance. In fact, the tensorial object written in eq. (32) is gauge invariant. The graviton mass term in massive gravity, breaks explicitly the diffeomorphism invariance. However, after introducing the Stückelberg fields in the form as in eq. (32), the massive term is gauge invariant under the following transformation:

$$g_{\mu\nu} \to \frac{\partial f^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\frac{\partial f^\beta}{\partial x^\nu} g_{\alpha\beta}(f(x)), \qquad Y^\mu(x) \to f^{-1}(Y(x))^\mu. \tag{33}$$

It is easy to verify that under this transformation, the tensorial object (32) is gauge invariant as it is demonstrated in [3]. The infinitesimal Stückelberg expansion:

$$Y^\alpha(x) = x^\alpha + A^\alpha(x), \tag{34}$$

provides the following result:

$$G_{\mu\nu} \approx g_{\mu\nu} + A^\lambda \partial_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu A^\alpha g_{\alpha\nu} + \partial_\nu A^\alpha g_{\alpha\mu} + \frac{1}{2}A^\alpha A^\beta \partial_\alpha\partial_\beta g_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu A^\alpha \partial_\nu A^\beta g_{\alpha\beta} + \partial_\mu A^\alpha A^\beta \partial_\beta g_{\alpha\nu} + \partial_\nu A^\alpha A^\beta \partial_\beta g_{\mu\alpha} + ... \tag{35}$$

The gauge transformations (33), when expanded infinitesimally as $f(x) = x + \zeta(x)$, provide the following infinitesimal expansions:

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu} = \zeta^\lambda \partial_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu \zeta^\lambda g_{\lambda\nu} + \partial \zeta^\lambda g_{\mu\lambda}, \tag{36}$$

$$\delta Y(x) = -\zeta^\mu(Y), \qquad \delta A^\mu = -\zeta^\mu - A^\alpha \partial_\alpha \zeta^\mu - \frac{1}{2}A^\alpha A^\beta \partial_\alpha\partial_\beta \zeta^\mu - ... \tag{37}$$

The A^μ correspond to the Goldstone bosons that non-linear carry the broken symmetry in massive gravity. It can be verified again that under the previous infinitesimal gauge transformations, eq. (35) provides:

$$\delta G_{\mu\nu} = 0. \tag{38}$$

In massive gravity, we replace the ordinary perturbation object $h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu}$, for the object:

$$H_{\mu\nu} = G_{\mu\nu} - g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu}, \tag{39}$$

where $g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu}$ is the absolute metric. In this case it also corresponds to the background metric. The result (39), when expanded infinitesimally, becomes:

$$H_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} + \nabla^{(0)}_{\mu} A_{\nu} + \nabla^{(0)}_{\nu} A_{\mu}, \tag{40}$$

where the indices for A_μ are lowered with the background metric. It can be verified that eq. (40) has the standard structure of the Stückelberg replacement. If the background metric is Minkowski, then eq. (40) can be expanded as:

$$H_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu A_\nu + \partial_\nu A_\mu + \partial_\mu A^\alpha \partial_\nu A_\alpha + ... \tag{41}$$

In this case, the indices for A^μ, are lowered by using the Minkowskian metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$. It is standard inside the Sückelberg trick to introduce the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry with the following replacement:

$$A_\mu \to A_\mu + \partial_\mu \phi. \tag{42}$$

Then the expansion (41) takes the form:

$$H_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu A_\nu + \partial_\nu A_\mu + 2\partial_\mu \partial_\nu \phi + \partial_\mu A^\alpha \partial_\nu A_\alpha + \partial_\mu A^\alpha \partial_\nu \partial_\alpha \phi + \partial_\mu \partial^\alpha \phi \partial_\nu A_\alpha + \partial_\mu \partial^\alpha \phi \partial_\nu \partial_\alpha \phi, \tag{43}$$

and the gauge transformation becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta h_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu \zeta_\nu + \partial_\nu \zeta_\mu + \pounds_\zeta h_{\mu\nu}, \\ \delta A_\mu &= \partial_\mu \Lambda - \zeta_\mu - A^\alpha \partial_\alpha \zeta_\mu - \frac{1}{2} A^\alpha A^\beta \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \zeta_\mu - ..., \\ \delta \phi &= -\Lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

More about this method of Stückelberg and its extensions can be found in [11].

B. Stückelberg fields appearing in the fiducial metric

Another way for exploring the Stückelberg formalism is by introducing the fields inside the fiducial metric. In such a case, the dynamical metric transforms covariantly as usual [3]. The idea is to do the following replacement:

$$g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} \to f_{\mu\nu} = g^{(0)}_{\alpha\beta} \partial_\mu Y^\alpha \partial_\nu Y^\beta, \tag{45}$$

where the Stückelberg fields transform as scalars under diffeomorphism transformations:

$$Y^\alpha(x) \to Y^\alpha(f(x)), \tag{46}$$

or infinitesimally:

$$\delta Y^\alpha(x) = \zeta^\beta \partial_\beta Y^\alpha(x). \tag{47}$$

Given this transformation, then the fiducial metric transforms as a tensor under diffeomorphism transformations. The perturbation $h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu}$, can now be replaced by:

$$H_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - f_{\mu\nu}, \tag{48}$$

with $f_{\mu\nu}$ defined as in eq. (45). Using again the transformation (34), together wit $h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu}$, we get:

$$H_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} + g^{(0)}_{\nu\alpha}\partial_\mu A^\alpha + g^{(0)}_{\mu\alpha}\partial_\nu A^\alpha - g^{(0)}_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\mu A^\alpha \partial_\nu A^\beta. \tag{49}$$

Again, using the replacement (42), we get:

$$H_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu A_\nu + \partial_\nu A_\mu + 2\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\phi + \partial_\mu A^\alpha \partial_\nu A_\alpha + \partial_\mu A^\alpha \partial_\nu\partial_\alpha\phi + \partial_\mu\partial^\alpha\phi\partial_\nu A_\alpha + \partial_\mu\partial^\alpha\phi\partial_\nu\partial_\alpha\phi. \tag{50}$$

Under infinitesimal gauge transformations, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta h_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu\zeta_\nu + \partial_\nu\zeta_\mu + \pounds_\zeta h_{\mu\nu}, \\ \delta A_\mu &= \partial_\mu\Lambda - \zeta_\mu + \zeta^\nu\partial_\nu A_\mu, \\ \delta\phi &= -\Lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Another way for introducing the Stückelberg fields, can be found in [12].

V. THE SCHWARZSCHILD DE-SITTER SOLUTION IN DRGT: UNITARY GAUGE

In [8], the S-dS solution in unitary gauge was derived for two different cases. The first one, corresponds to the family of solutions satisfying the condition $\beta = \alpha^2$, where β and α correspond to the two free-parameters of the theory. In such a case, the gauge transformation function $T_0(r,t)$ becomes arbitrary. The second one, corresponds to the family of solutions with two-free parameters satisfying the condition $\beta \leq \alpha^2$ with the gauge transformation function $T_0(r,t)$ constrained. The generic solution is given explicitly as:

$$ds^2 = G_{tt}dt^2 + G_{rr}dr^2 + G_{rt}(drdt + dtdr) + r^2 d\Omega_2^2, \tag{52}$$

where:

$$G_{tt} = -f(r)(\partial_t T_0(r,t))^2, \quad G_{rr} = -f(r)(\partial_r T_0(r,t))^2 + \frac{1}{f(r)}, \quad G_{tr} = -f(r)\partial_t T_0(r,t)\partial_r T_0(r,t), \tag{53}$$

where $f(r) = 1 - \frac{2GM}{r} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2$. In this previous solution, all the degrees of freedom are inside the dynamical metric. The fiducial metric in this case is just the Minkowskian one given explicitly as:

$$f_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu = -dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{S_0^2} + \frac{r^2}{S_0^2}(d\theta^2 + r^2 sin^2\theta), \tag{54}$$

where $S_0 = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}$. The Stückleberg fields take the standard form defined in [8]. It was demonstrated that this solution is stable with a natural degeneracy associated to the solution $\beta = \alpha^2$. This degeneracy however, does not affect the motion of a test particle around the black-hole if we define the appropriate conserved quantities [6]. The solution (53) can be equivalently written as:

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dT_0(r,t)^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + r^2 d\Omega^2, \tag{55}$$

where $T_0(r,t)$ corresponds to the "gauge" function. In this case however, this function contains the information of the Stückelberg fields in agreement with the formulation of Sec. (IV A). In fact, the metric (55), with the definitions (53) is gauge-invariant under the transformations defined in (33) with $T_0(r,t) = f(Y(r,t))$. The Stückelberg fields appear inside $T_0(r,t)$ as the spatial derivative of the function $T_0(r,t)$. The explicit relations are:

$$T_0 = Y^0 = t + A(r), \qquad Y^r = r, \tag{56}$$

in agreement with the notations used in [6, 8] and the notation of section (IV A). Then the metric (55) is gauge invariant under the transformations (33), as can be easily verified.

VI. THE VAINSHTEIN MECHANISM IN TERMS OF GAUGE FUNCTIONS: STÜCKELBERG FIELDS INSIDE THE DYNAMICAL METRIC

In [6], the Vainshtein conditions in terms of "gauge" functions were found. The gauge functions in such a case, correspond to Y^β in agreement with the notation of the previous section. They store the information of the extra-degrees of freedom (in spherical symmetry) of the theory through its spatial dependence. The Vainshtein conditions in [6] correspond to:

$$dG_{\mu\nu} = \left(\frac{\partial G_{\mu\nu}}{\partial r}\right)_t dr + \left(\frac{\partial G_{\mu\nu}}{\partial t}\right)_r dt = 0, \tag{57}$$

where the notation $\left(\frac{\partial g_{\mu\nu}}{\partial w}\right)_x$ is just the partial derivative with respect to w but keeping the variable x constant. When applied to a static metric solution, eq. (57) is equivalent to $\partial g_{\mu\nu}/\partial r = 0$. We can apply the same extremal conditions in dRGT theory in unitary gauge. In such a case, all the degrees of freedom (five in total) are inside the dynamical metric. In dRGT, the extremal condition (57) marks the scale after which the metric behavior begins to change. This scale is in fact the Vainshtein scale (Vainshtein radius for metrics becoming static after redefinitions). If we introduce the metric defined in (53) inside the condition (57), then we obtain the Vainshtein conditions for the metric under study. For the $t-t$ component, we get:

$$\left(f'(r)(\partial_t T_0(r,t))^2 + 2f(r)(\partial_t T_0(r,t))(\partial_r \partial_t T_0(r,t))\right) dr + 2f(r)(\partial_t T_0(r,t))\partial_t^2 T_0(r,t) dt = 0. \tag{58}$$

For the quasi-stationary case (i.e, the case where the metric can be translated to static coordinates after removing the Stückelberg contributions), we can again assume $T_0(r,t) \backsim t + A(r)$, where $A(r)$ is an arbitrary function on space. Then the previous condition is reduced to $f'(r) = 0$. For the $r-r$ component, we have to satisfy:

$$\left(f'(r)(\partial_r T_0(r,t))^2+2f(r)(\partial_r T_0(r,t))(\partial_r^2 T_0(r,t))+\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)^2}\right)dr \\ +2f(r)(\partial_r T_0(r,t))(\partial_t\partial_r T_0(r,t))dt=0. \tag{59}$$

Again, if we assume quasi-stationary condition, then the previous result is reduced to:

$$T_0'(r,t)\left(f'(r)T_0'(r,t)+2f(r)T_0''(r,t)\right)+\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)^2}=0. \tag{60}$$

Finally, for the $t-r$ component, we get:

$$(f'(r)(\partial_t T_0(r,t))(\partial_r T_0(r,t))+f(r)(\partial_t\partial_r T_0(r,t))(\partial_r T_0(r,t))+f(r)(\partial_t T_0(r,t))\times \\ (\partial_r^2 T_0(r,t)))dr+\left(f(r)(\partial_t^2 T_0(r,t))(\partial_r T_0(r,t))+f(r)(\partial_t T_0(r,t))(\partial_r\partial_t T_0(r,t))\right)dt=0. \tag{61}$$

Once again, if the dynamical metric is quasi-stationary, then we get:

$$\frac{T_0''(r,t)}{T_0'(r,t)}=-\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)}=C, \tag{62}$$

where C is an arbitrary constant and we assume $\partial_r\partial_t T_0(r,t)=0$ and $\partial_t T_0(r,t)=1$. Eq. (62) can be solved by separation of variables. By assuming a general exponential behavior, we would get:

$$T_0(r,t)=Ae^{Cr}, \qquad f(r)=Be^{-Cr}. \tag{63}$$

If we replace the condition (62) inside eq. (60), then we get:

$$T_0'(r,t)=\pm f^{-1}, \tag{64}$$

which is consistent with the result (63). This also implies that under the quasi-stationary condition, at the Vainshtein radius, $T_0''(r,t)=0$ in agreement with the result obtained from (58). The set of conditions condensed in the single expression (57) is what I have called "Vainshtein conditions" in [6]. From them we can find the Vainshtein scale which can be time-dependent for general backgrounds. The Vainshtein scale becomes equivalent to the already known Vainshtein radius when the metric is time-independent. In such a case, the result (57) is reduced to $\partial g_{\mu\nu}/\partial r=0$, obtaining then as a Vainshtein radius the result $r=r_0$ in agreement with the notation [6]. This explains the origin of the coincidence with respect to the same scale r_0 obtained from GR. Just for completing the previous arguments, we can specify that the Vainshtein scale is marked by three regimes:

$$\partial_r T_0(r,t)=0 \quad \rightarrow \quad r<<r_V, \qquad \partial_r T_0(r,t)\neq 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad r>>r_V \\ T_0''(r,t)=0 \quad \rightarrow \quad r=r_V, \tag{65}$$

where r_V is just the Vainshtein scale. At first sight, the previous arguments seem to be a mere coincidence. In this section I will explain that the Vainshtein mechanism is reduced to the set (65). The idea is to show that the conditions (57), contain the Galileon structure, similar to the one explained in section (II), if this is true, then the Vainshtein mechanism will

appear exactly in the same form as in the case of the Galileon Lagrangian. For that purpose, we have to use the explanations of section (IV A). Starting with the infinitesimal definition (25) or (34), and using the redefinitions $\pi_\alpha = \partial_\alpha \pi/\Lambda_3^3$, it is possible to observe that from the so-called Vainshtein conditions (58), (59) and (61), only the second one (corresponding to the $r-r$ component), has the Galileon structure similar to the one found in eq. (9). In terms of the mentioned variables, eq. (59) has the structure:

$$(\pi'')^2 + 2\left(\frac{f(r)}{f'(r)}\right)(\pi''')(\pi'') + \frac{\Lambda_3^6}{f(r)^2} = 0, \tag{66}$$

where here I ignore whether the derivative is spatial or temporal; what really matters from this previous equation is that its structure is the same as the one found in (9) (ignoring the fact that here we work with the square of the strong coupling scale Λ_3, as well as the number of derivatives involved). The Vainshtein mechanism for the solutions obtained in [8], appears explicitly for quantities involving the time-parameter. It means that a particle moving around a spherically symmetric source, will experience exactly the same motion as a particle in GR, as far as the motion is stationary (time-independent). This is true if we are able to define the appropriate conserved quantities. Let's write the action of a test particle moving around the source. The gauge invariant action is in agreement with [6]:

$$G_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu = C, \tag{67}$$

after replacing the metric (53) inside the previous expression and then taking into account the conserved quantities:

$$G_{tt}\left(\frac{dt}{d\tau}\right) + G_{rt}\left(\frac{dr}{d\tau}\right) = E_{dRGT}, \qquad L = r^2\frac{d\phi}{d\tau}, \tag{68}$$

we obtain the conservation equation:

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{dr}{d\tau}\right)^2 + \frac{L^2}{2r^2}f(r) = \left(-f(r) + \left(\frac{E_{dRGT}}{\dot{T}_0}\right)^2\right). \tag{69}$$

For stationary spacetimes, the gauge-function is $T_0(r,t) = t + A(r)$ in agreement with the analysis performed in [6]. Then $\dot{T}_0$ is just a unity factor. Eq. (69) shows that the description of a test particle for spherically symmetric objects. Eq. (69), demonstrates that the motion of a test particle is not affected by the presence of the extra-degrees of freedom as far as the time component becomes ignorable. This is true if we define the appropriate conserved quantities. On the other hand, as far as the system becomes dynamically evolving, the role of the Vainshtein mechanism for restoring GR, becomes relevant.

VII. THE VAINSHTEIN MECHANISM AS A MECHANISM FOR RECOVERING THE BIRKHOFF THEOREM

In GR, the Birkhoff theorem states that the only vacuum solution with spherical symmetry is the Schwarzschild one (for asymptotically flat spaces) or the S-dS if we include a cosmological constant (Λ). It states that there are no time-dependent solutions of this form. In the previous section, we have used the quasi-stationary approximation for the spherically symmetric solution (53), which implies $T_0(r,t) = t + A(r)$. The non-diagonal contribution

g_{tr}, coming explicitly from the Stückelberg field contribution, breaks the static condition (not necessarily the stationary one). Then the Birkhoff theorem is not valid in massive gravity and a series of vacuum solutions might emerge. It has been proved in [8] however, that the generic solution is written as:

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dT_0^2 + \frac{1}{f(r)}dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2, \tag{70}$$

with $dT_0(r,t) = T_0' dr + \dot{T}_0 dt$. The Birkhoff theorem in its standard form suggests that we can determine the function $T_0(r,t)$ precisely such that it is possible to cancel the crossed terms $drdt + dtdr$ coming from the generic metric (70). Determining this function precisely, is possible for the case of two-free parameters as it is explained in [8]. For the case $\beta = \alpha^2$ (one-free parameter) worked in [8], the function $T_0(r,t)$ is arbitrary in principle. Since that function contains the information of the extra-degrees of freedom in the spatial dependence of $T_0(r,t)$, then the degeneracy of the theory comes from the Stückelberg fields. In this way the Birkhoff theorem is in general not satisfied in dRGT. The Vainshtein mechanism however, compensates this apparent pathology by keeping the extra-degrees of freedom negligible for scales satisfying the condition $r << r_V$. In such scales, the condition $fT_0'(r,t) \to 0$ is satisfied and then the Birkhoff theorem is recovered, at least partially. On the other hand, for scales near the cosmological horizon $r \to r_\Lambda$, the Vainshtein mechanism also operates and provides the de-Sitter solution as the only attractor one for an asymptotically de-Sitter space since still the condition $f(r)\partial_r T_0(r,t) \to 0$ is satisfied. This is by the way the Cosmic no hair conjecture, already studied in the literature [7]. Then we can conclude that the cosmic no-hair conjecture is a manifestation of the Vainshtein mechanism at large scales in dRGT. Note that the non-linearities appear through the source terms which are implicitly inside the dynamical metric. Then even in vacuum, the Vainshtein mechanism operates in an implicit form. In other words, it is not necessary to have an explicit source in order to perceive the Vainshtein mechanism effects. The scales in physics are independent on whether matter is present or not.

VIII. THE VAINSHTEIN MECHANISM AS A DUALITY OF THE PARTICLE CREATION PROCESS

In curved spacetimes it is natural to expect the possibility of particle creation by black-holes. The original work developed by Hawking [13] used the fact that the particle is an observer-dependent notion. Here I will follow the original Hawking approach because it is the most natural in order to explain the possible discrepancy between dRGT and GR. The key point of the analysis is the direction of the time-like Killing vector which becomes arbitrary in some sense after the Vainshtein radius. This generates a possible extra phase contribution for the black-hole radiation which however does not come from the horizon itself. It comes as a contribution of the extra-degrees of freedom of the theory which become relevant after the Vainshtein scale. This contribution is not perceived by the observer located below the Vainshtein scale where the extra-degrees of freedom become negligible. This makes the Vainshtein scale and its coincidence analyzed in [6] quite relevant at this level. For simplicity in what follows I will assume an asymptotically-flat space such that the radiation coming from the cosmological horizon and the Vainshtein mechanism involved at that scale, do not become relevant inside the analysis. The space can be asymptotically flat even for

the S-dS solution in dRGT, if we take the solution with two free parameters and the gauge transformation function defined with $\beta = (3/4)\alpha^2$ [8]. This however will not be relevant in the analysis. For simplicity I will also assume that the extra-degrees of freedom appear immediately after the Vainshtein scale, such that $T_0(r,t) = t$ at the Vainshtein scale, but it becomes $T_0(r,t) = t + A(r,t)$ for an infinitesimal displacement $-\epsilon$ going way from the source (larger values of r). Under the assumption of asymptotic flatness, the metric is just the Schwarzschild one. The Penrose diagram of this space is well known (See Fig. (1)). As a starting point I will explain in a heuristic form why it is possible to confuse the radiation coming from the event horizon, with the effects of the extra-degrees of freedom not necessarily coming from the horizon. For that purpose, we have to analyze the canonical quantization of a scalar field. In curved space-time, the scalar product for two scalar fields, is defined as:

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2) = -i \int_\Sigma \left(\phi_1(x)\partial_\mu \phi_2^*(x) - \partial_\mu \phi_2^*(x)\phi_1(x)\right) \left[-g_\Sigma(x)\right]^{1/2} d\Sigma^\mu, \tag{71}$$

where $d\Sigma^\mu = n^\mu d\Sigma$, with n^μ being a unit future-directed vector orthogonal to the space-like hypersurface Σ and $d\Sigma$ is the volume element in Σ. The scalar field $\phi_n(x)$, can be expanded as:

$$\phi(x) = \Sigma_i [\hat{a}_i u_i(x) + \hat{a}_i^+ u_i^*(x)], \tag{72}$$

where $u_i(x)$ is the set of mode solutions for the scalar field. By using the definition (71), the annihilation and creation operators $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{a}^+$, must satisfy the following canonical commutation relations:

$$[\hat{a}_i, \hat{a}_j^+] = \delta_{ij}, \qquad [\hat{a}_i^+, \hat{a}_j^+] = 0, \qquad [\hat{a}_i, \hat{a}_j] = 0. \tag{73}$$

This is true since the set of modes $u_i(x)$, are orthonormal under the product definition (71). What is fundamental inside the canonical quantization, is with respect to which coordinate system we define the modes, this means that the set of modes, represented by the set of functions $u_i(x)$, are closely related to the coordinates under study. As a trivial example in Minkowski space, the set of modes are naturally defined with respect to a Cartesian coordinate system t, x, y, z. These natural coordinates are associated to the invariance of the line element under the Poincare group. Then the set $u_i(x)$ are eigenvectors of the time-like Killing vector with eigenvalue $-i\omega$ as follows:

$$K^t u_i(x) = -i\omega u_i(x). \tag{74}$$

With $K^t = \partial/\partial t$ and $u_i(x) = e^{ikx}$. The particles are defined with respect to this positive frequency. From the previous results, it is possible to observe that already in massive gravity, the Stückelberg fields will introduce some ambiguity for the definition of the particle concept. This is true because the set of modes $u_i(x)$, can be defined with respect to the usual coordinates t, x, y, z if the degrees of freedom are inside the fiducial metric (background). Or, on the other hand, the set of modes can also be defined with respect to the coordinates $T_0(x, y, z, t), x, y, z$, which contains explicitly the contribution of the extra degrees of freedom contained inside the dynamical metric (unitary gauge). By defining the particles with respect to these different set of modes, can create misunderstandings in the interpretation of the concept of particle creation in black-holes when we analyze the process in the non-linear theory of massive gravity, especially for observers located at scales satisfying $r >> r_V$.

Another way to see this, is by looking at the expression (32), where the Stückelberg fields enter in a similar form of a coordinate transformation. Defining the modes with respect to the coordinates with and without Stückelberg fields inside the dynamical metric, might bring different interpretations of the particle concept as we will see in a moment. Assume for a moment that we have a vacuum defined with respect to the usual coordinates as:

$$\hat{a}_i|0>=0. \tag{75}$$

In such a case, the vacuum is excluding the Stückelberg contribution, which would appear as excitations over the vacuum. However, we can define another set of modes with respect to a new vacuum, perhaps degenerate, where the Stückelberg fields belong to it. This new vacuum can be defined with a new complete set of modes, able to expand the scalar field as:

$$\phi(x) = \Sigma_i[\hat{\bar{a}}_i\bar{u}_i(x) + \hat{\bar{a}}_i^*\bar{u}_i^*(x)]. \tag{76}$$

Assume that this new set of modes are defined with respect to a new coordinate system defined as $T_0(x,y,z,t), x, y, z$, with T_0 containing the contribution of the extra-degrees of freedom. In this new set, the extra-degrees of freedom will not appear as excitations in this new vacuum. They will rather become implicit part of the coordinate system. In fact, the result (76) would be the relevant one for a dynamical metric containing all the degrees of freedom inside it as it is manifest from eq. (32) and the explicit form of the solution (53). The two sets are related by the same Bogolubov transformations as usual. These transformations are defined as:

$$\bar{u}_j = \Sigma_i \left(\alpha_{ji}u_i + \beta_{ji}u_i^*\right), \tag{77}$$

$$u_i = \Sigma_j \left(\alpha_{ji}^*\bar{u}_j - \beta_{ji}\bar{u}_j^*\right). \tag{78}$$

With these relations we can express the scalar field expansion in terms of both sets of modes defined previously. The particle creation process is related to the fact that there are mixes of positive and negative frequency modes in some regions of spacetime; this happens when the condition $\beta_{ij} \neq 0$ is satisfied. This does not happen in Minkowski spacetime, but it happens when the curvature effects of gravity appear. The case which we are analyzing, is a different one. In this case we are not yet considering the curvature effects but I am showing that it is possible in principle to confuse particle creation process with extra-degrees of freedom coming from the theory. It is in this form that the Vainshtein mechanism will appear as a duality of the particle creation process. For the moment, we can complete the essential idea behind the previous formulation and say that from eqns (77) and (78), we can get:

$$\alpha_{ij} = (\bar{u}_i, u_j), \qquad \beta_{ij} = -(\bar{u}_i, u_j^*), \tag{79}$$

and then the annihilation operators of the two different sets can be written as:

$$\hat{a}_i = \Sigma_j \left(\alpha_{ji}\hat{\bar{a}}_j + \beta_{ji}^*\hat{\bar{a}}_j^+\right), \tag{80}$$

$$\hat{\bar{a}}_j = \Sigma_i \left(\alpha_{ji}^*\hat{a}_i - \beta_{ji}^*\hat{a}_i^+\right), \tag{81}$$

with the Bogolubov coefficients satisfying the usual relations. Note that if $\beta_{ij} \neq 0$, then we get:

$$\hat{a}_i|\bar{0}>=\Sigma_j\beta^*_{ji}|\bar{1}>\neq 0. \tag{82}$$

Then the expectation value of the particle operator $\hat{N}_i=\hat{a}^+\hat{a}$, in the vacuum defined by $|\bar{0}>$ is given by:

$$<\bar{0}|\hat{N}_i|\bar{0}>=\Sigma_j|\beta_{ji}|^2. \tag{83}$$

Then the only possibility in order to describe the extra-degrees of freedom as particles created by the vacuum is that the two set of modes defined previously differ in the definition of positive and negative frequencies. This can be seen from eq. (74) and thinking now in a new set of modes expanded with respect to a new Killing vector defined with respect to $T_0(r,t)$. In terms of the new set of modes given by by $\bar{u}_i \backsim exp(ikX)$, with $X^0=T_0(r,t)$, we get:

$$K^{T_0}\bar{u}_i=-i\omega\bar{u}_i, \tag{84}$$

with $K^{T_0}=\partial/\partial T_0(r,t)$. This is the positive-frequency condition with respect to the vacuum $|\bar{0}>$. If for any reason we use this Killing vector with respect to the set of modes of the vacuum $|0>$, which excludes the Stückelberg fields, we will obtain the result:

$$K^{T_0}u_i=-i\omega\frac{u_j}{\dot{T}_0}+i\omega\frac{u_j}{T_0'}, \tag{85}$$

for a massless scalar field. This opens the possibility of mixes of positive and negative frequencies with respect of the modes defined for the vacuum $|0>$. In what follows I will show how this physical effect affects the observation of the particles emitted by a black-hole. For simplicity I will assume the space-time to be asymptotically flat, which is possible even for the generic solutions in [8], as far as the condition $\beta=(3/4)\alpha^2$ is satisfied for the case of two-free parameters. This will not be important at the moment of performing the following analysis.

A. The particle creation process

Here I will use the approach followed by Hawking in the original derivation of the black-hole radiation [13]. It is this approach with some simplifications, the one which can provide the best physical interpretation of the Vainshtein mechanism as a duality of the particle creation process. The Penrose diagram of the Schwarzschild metric maximally extended is given by Fig. (1), which is taken from [13].

In the figure we can identify the different regions. The explanation of these regions can be found in [14]. Here we can start with the analysis of a massless scalar field, satisfying the field equation:

$$g^{ab}\phi_{;ab}=0. \tag{86}$$

In the same way as before, the operator can be expanded in terms of a complete set of functions satisfying:

$$\phi(x)=\Sigma_i\left(f_i(x)\hat{a}_i+\bar{f}_i(x)\hat{a}_i^+\right). \tag{87}$$



FIG. 1: The Penrose diagram for the analytical extended Schwarzschild solution. Fig. Taken from [13]

These functions will be defined in the past-null infinity $\mathscr{I}^-$ and there they define a complete set of orthonormal functions, satisfying the conditions (71) over the surface Σ. They satisfy the equation $g^{ab}f_{i;ab} = 0$ in agreement with (86). In this region ($\mathscr{I}^-$), however, we expect some extra contribution coming from the dual version of the Vainshtein mechanism appearing as particles created after the distance $r = r_V$ as will be explained in a moment. In $\mathscr{I}^-$, the functions f_i will contain only positive frequencies with respect to the affine parameter. We will then take the operators $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{a}^+$ as the annihilation and creation operators for the ingoing particles (at the past null infinity). As in the standard case, the massless operator can be expressed in the form (87) everywhere. Take into account however, that if the vacuum defined for the annihilation operator $\hat{a}$ is a vacuum with respect to the Killing vector in the direction $T_0(r,t)$, then the extra-degrees of freedom contribution would be absent as far as we define the modes correspondingly. If we take the vacuum in the direction of the usual Killing vector pointing in the direction of the standard time-coordinate, then the extra-degrees of freedom will appear as excitation over the vacuum and they will appear as some extra-component of radiation. The scalar field $\phi(x)$ can also be written in terms of the data at the event horizon and on the future null infinity $\mathscr{I}^+$. Then $\phi(x)$ can be expressed as:

$$\phi(x) = \Sigma_i \left(p_i(x)\hat{b}_i + \bar{p}_i(x)\hat{b}_i^+ + q_i(x)\hat{c}_i + \bar{q}_i(x)\hat{c}_i^+ \right), \tag{88}$$

where as usual, the p_i solutions contain zero Cauchy data at the event horizon. On the other hand, the solutions q_i, contain zero Cauchy data on $\mathscr{I}^+$. Both set of solutions form a complete set of orthonormal functions over the respective surfaces Σ defined at the event horizon or $\mathscr{I}^+$. The p_i functions, are required to contain only positive frequencies with respect to the canonical affine parameter along the null geodesic generators of $\mathscr{I}^+$. In this case, again the positive frequencies can be defined with respect to the Killing vector in the direction T_0, ignoring then the extra-degrees of freedom contribution, otherwise there will be an extra contribution coming from the Stückelberg fields with the Vainshtein mechanism acting as duality of the particle creation process. This is the matter of the present analysis. Then the annihilation and creation operators $\hat{b}_i$ and $\hat{b}_i^+$ destroy and create particles at $\mathscr{I}^+$. As we have said before, massless fields are completely determined by their data on $\mathscr{I}-$, then we can express the functions p_i and q_i as linear combinations of the functions f_i in the same form explained in eqns. (77) and (78). Additionally, we can expand the annihilation

and creation operators $\hat{b}_i's$ and $\hat{c}_i's$ as linear combinations of the operators $\hat{a}_i's$ in the same form explained in eqns. (80) and (81) with the corresponding adjoints. In what follows, we have to decide which vacuum will be selected for the operators $\hat{a}_i$. If we select the vacuum with respect to the usual Killing vector K^t, then the extra-degrees of freedom of the theory will appear as an extra-contribution of the particle creation process. An observer located at a distance larger than the Vainshtein scale r_V will not be able to distinguish whether or not this contribution comes from the black-hole or another source. On the other hand, an observer at scales equal or below r_V, will be able to describe the appropriate value o temperature. This duality is analogous to what happens in the standard S-dS solution when we have to define the static observer located at $r = r_0$ in agreement with the results obtained in [6]. The scale of duality being the Vainshtein radius. On the other hand, if we select the Killing vector on both surfaces, $\mathscr{I}^+$ and $\mathscr{I}^-$ in the direction T_0, then the observer located on $\mathscr{I}^+$, will describe exactly the same standard process of particle creation of black-holes and he will obtain the standard result $\kappa \backsim \frac{1}{GM}$ for the surface gravity. In order to observe the effects of the Stückelberg fields, then I will write the vacuum on $\mathscr{I}^-$ and $\mathscr{I}^+$ with respect to the standard Killing vector K^t. Independent of the type of vacuum selected, the operators $\hat{a}_i's$ and $\hat{b}_i's$ in general will represent different vacuum states if the Bogolubov coefficient β_{ij} is different from zero. Then the observer at $\mathscr{I}^+$ will perceive a particle creation process in agreement with:

$$< 0_-|\hat{b}_i^+\hat{b}_i|0_- >= \Sigma_j|\beta_{ij}|^2. \tag{89}$$

By taking the Killing vector on the surface $\mathscr{I}^+$ as K^t, automatically we are counting the extra-degrees of freedom inside the number (89). Later we will see how the extra contribution will appear explicitly. Although some parts of β_{ij} will depend on the gravitational collapse details, here I will follow the procedure suggested by Hawking [13], where he calculated the asymptotic form of β_{ij} which depends on the surface gravity of the black-hole. Although a finite amount of particles depending on the details of the gravitational collapse will appear, they will eventually disappear at $\mathscr{I}^+$ and a steady flux of particles will remain, determined by the asymptotic form of β_{ij}. On the other hand, for the case where the cosmological constant is non-zero $\Lambda \neq 0$, the extra-degrees of freedom also become negligible at the cosmological horizon scales in agreement with the Vainshtein conditions derived in Sec. (VI), where the Vainshtein mechanism appears with a dual role restoring GR not only at scales near the sources, but at scales near the cosmological horizon. In order to analyze the asymptotic form of β_{ij}, we can define ingoing and outgoing solutions of the wave equation as a Fourier expansion in terms of extended advanced and retarded coordinates as follows:

$$f_{\omega' lm} = (2\pi)^{-1/2} r^{-1} (\omega')^{-1/2} F_{\omega'}(r) e^{i\omega' V} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi), \tag{90}$$

$$p_{\omega lm} = (2\pi)^{-1/2} r^{-1} (\omega)^{-1/2} F_{\omega'}(r) e^{i\omega' U} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi), \tag{91}$$

where we have defined U and V as the extended version of the advanced and retarded null coordinates as follows:

$$V = T_0(r,t) + r + 2Mlog\left|\frac{r}{2M} - 1\right|, \tag{92}$$

$$U = T_0(r,t) - r - 2Mlog\left|\frac{r}{2M} - 1\right|, \tag{93}$$



FIG. 2: In dRGT, the solution p_ω will have an infinite number of cycles as in the case of the standard GR. Fig. Taken from [13]

with $T_0(r,t) = t + A(r)$. During the collapsing process, however, it is possible for $T_0(r,t)$ to get some complicated dependence on space and time. However in our case we are focusing in the asymptotic behavior of the process, where a steady state condition is accomplished. By taking the extended advanced and retarded null coordinates, an observer at $\mathscr{I}^+$ will perceive the standard particle production if he/she defines the time-like Killing vector with respect to the coordinate $T_0(r,t)$ and if additionally, the observer at $\mathscr{I}^-$ does the same. On the other hand, if we define the observers at $\mathscr{I}^+$ and $\mathscr{I}^-$ with respect to the standard time coordinate t, then an extra contribution coming from the Sückelberg fields contribution will appear. The solutions p_i can be expressed in terms of the solutions f_i as:

$$p_\omega = \int_0^\infty (\alpha_{\omega\omega'} f'_\omega + \beta_{\omega\omega'} \bar{f}'_\omega) d\omega', \tag{94}$$

where we assume the same values of l and $|m|$ for both set of functions. As usual, in order to calculate the Bogolubov coefficients $\alpha_{\omega\omega'}$ and $\beta_{\omega\omega'}$, we consider the solution p_ω propagating backwards, starting from $\mathscr{I}^+$ with zero Cauchy data at the horizon. A part $p^{(1)}_\omega$ will be scattered by the Schwarzschild field outside the collapsing object and it will end up at $\mathscr{I}^-$ with exactly the same frequency. This part will not contribute to the particle creation process and it will simply gives $\delta(\omega - \omega')$ in $\alpha_{\omega\omega'}$. On the other hand, the other part $p^{(2)}_\omega$, will enter the collapsing object, where it will be partially scattered and partially reflected through the center, eventually emerging toward $\mathscr{I}^-$. This part corresponds to the particle creation process and here we expect some modifications due to the extra-degrees of freedom entering through the spatial dependence of $T_0(r,t)$. Here we can still use the geometric optics approximation since the extended retarded coordinate will still goes to infinity at the horizon and anyway the contribution $A(r)$ will be negligible as it is expected from the Vainshtein mechanism arguments. Then anyway, the analysis will not differ at this point from the standard one. On $\mathscr{I}^-$, $p^{(2)}_\omega$ will have an infinite number of cycles just before $V = V_0$ or $v = v_0$, (See Fig. (2)).

If we extend analytically the space-time, forgetting for a moment the fact that there is an object collapsing at the center, we can determine a relation between what is observed in $\mathscr{I}^-$, with what is observed in $\mathscr{I}^+$. For that purpose, it is necessary to relate the extended notions

of advanced and retarded time $U(r,t)$ and $V(r,t)$. If we work over a region near to the event horizon of the diagram (1), the geometric optic approximation is valid. Additionally, near the past event horizon, we can work under the assumption $V(r,t) \approx v(r,t)$ because that region satisfies the condition $r << r_V$ with respect to the surface $\mathscr{I}^+$ and it implies that the gravitational field is strong and the extra-degrees of freedom are negligible in such a case. For the case of $U(r,t)$, however, this will not be the case once we reach a distance larger than r_V, with respect to the future event horizon, in such a case, at distances near $\mathscr{I}^-$, the extra-degrees of freedom contribution will be important. As has been said before, we are assuming that both observers, the one at $\mathscr{I}^+$ and $\mathscr{I}^-$, define the vacuum with respect to the usual notion of Killing vector K^t. What we want in essence is to determine the form of $p_\omega^{(2)}$ at $\mathscr{I}^-$, but at the same time near $v \approx v_0$. As in the standard case, let's define the product between two null vectors as $n^a l_a = -1$. The vector n^a is a future-directed (inward) null vector at a point x over the future event horizon. The vector l^a is a future null vector tangent to the horizon itself. Under these definitions, the vector $-\epsilon n^a$, with ϵ infinitesimal, will connect the solution $p_\omega^{(2)}$ at the event horizon, with a near null surface at a retarded time $U(r,t) \approx u(r,t)$ with the corresponding constant phase in agreement with eq. (91). With the space-time analytically extended, we can parallel transport the vector system n^a and l^a, through the future event horizon until they arrive at the intersection point between the past and future event horizon. Then the vector $-\epsilon n^a$ will lie along the past event horizon. We can define an affine parameter along the past event horizon, which is related to the parameter $U(r,t)$ through the relation:

$$\lambda = -Ce^{-\kappa U}, \tag{95}$$

where κ is the surface gravity. And the affine parameter is defined such that $\lambda = -\epsilon$ and at the point of intersection of the two horizons, $\lambda = 0$ and $\frac{dx^a}{d\lambda} = n^a$. That the relation (95) is correct, can be seen from the surface gravity equation, defined as:

$$K^\mu K^\nu{}_{\mu} = -\kappa K^\nu. \tag{96}$$

The surface gravity is basically the acceleration of an observer near the horizon as it is perceived by a static observer located at the infinity for the case of the Schwarzschild metric (asymptotically flat case). The surface gravity in equation (96) is evidently defined with respect to a non-affine parameter related to the Killing vector K^t. In general, any geodesic equation can be written as:

$$K^\mu K^\nu{}_{;\mu} = f(\alpha) K^\nu. \tag{97}$$

If we want this equation to become a geodesic one, it is necessary to define the following transformation:

$$f(\alpha) = -\left(\frac{d^2\alpha}{d\lambda^2}\right) / \left(\frac{d\alpha}{d\lambda}\right)^{-2}. \tag{98}$$

In fact, by taking $U(r,t) = \alpha$, we get $f(\alpha) = -\kappa$ if we use the relation (95). The surface gravity (96) is defined at the horizon. The vector $-\epsilon n^a$, connects the future event horizon with the surface of constant phase:

$$phase = -\frac{\omega}{\kappa}\left(log\epsilon - logC\right), \tag{99}$$

of the solution $p_\omega^{(2)}$. This previous result can be obtained from the relation (95). At this level, still $U(r,t) \approx u(r,t)$ and similarly $V(r,t) \approx v(r,t)$ due to the strong gravitational field. Although the result is obtained for the analytically extended Schwarzschild space-time, it is also valid in the presence of a collapsing object, as far as we are working outside the object [13]. Assume now that we parallel transport the vector n^a through the past event horizon until it reach the region $\mathscr{I}^-$. Then the solution $p_\omega^{(2)}$ will still obey the geometric optics approximation because the effective frequency would be very high. Then under the geometric optic approximation, the vector $-\epsilon n^a$, will still connect the solution of $p_\omega^{(2)}$ with a phase constant surface related to the parameter $U(r,t)$. The key point of this analysis is the fact that at $\mathscr{I}^-$, the Killing vector as it is defined usually K^t, is parallel in principle to the vector n^a. Note that if n^a is parallel to K^{T_0} (the extended Killing vector in dRGT), the observer will perceive exactly the same radiation as in the Hawking case. Then in reality there is no change in the radiation emitted from the event horizon of the black-hole in dRGT. What really changes is the notion of Killing vector and the fact that an observer defining a Killing vector in the usual way with respect to the standard notion of time, will observe an extra contribution coming from the extra-degrees of freedom in dRGT. This is true because in this vacuum defined with respect to K^t, the Sückelberg fields appear as particles created during the process. There is no way for the observer located at the infinity to distinguish whether this extra contribution comes from the black-hole itself or another source. However, an observer at $r = r_V$, can distinguish between the two contributions and in principle can send a signal to the observer at $\mathscr{I}^+$ with such information. The apparent extra contribution for an observer defining the particles in agreement with K^t, will appear at this level of the calculation as an extra phase shift in eq. (99). At $\mathscr{I}^-$, the extra-degrees of freedom of massive gravity will become important for the extended version of the retarded time given in eq. (93). For the case of the advanced time, however, we can still work under the assumption $V(r,t) \approx v(r,t)$ because the vector n^a is still near the region corresponding to the past event horizon. Then we can rewrite eq. (95) as:

$$\lambda = -Ce^{-\kappa(u+A(r))}, \tag{100}$$

with $U(r,t) = u(r,t) + A(r)$. With an equivalent parameter $\epsilon \to \epsilon'$, the phase (99) is modified to:

$$phase = -\frac{\omega}{\kappa}\left(log\epsilon' - logC + A(r)\kappa\right), \tag{101}$$

then already at this point we can see that in principle there is an extra-phase contribution coming from T_0, for an observer defining the Killing vector in the usual way K^t. If we assume for a moment that $T_0(r,t)$ is arbitrary, then there might be an arbitrary contribution to the apparent particle creation process, which is not coming from the event horizon if the observer at $\mathscr{I}^-$ does not arrange his ship in order to define the appropriate Killing vector in agreement with K^{T_0}. If $n^a = DK^a$ in $\mathscr{I}^-$, then for $V - V_0$ small and positive, the phase of the solution will be:

$$phase = -\frac{\omega}{\kappa}\left(log(V - V_0) - logD - logC + A(r)\kappa\right), \tag{102}$$

where the extra contribution coming from $A(r)$ appears for the observer defining the Killing vector as K^t. This is similar to the situation of the calculation of the Komar energy-function performed by the author in [15] by taking the usual notion of time-like Killing

vector. If the Killing vector is taken with respect to $T_0(r,t)$, then any modification of the Komar energy function would disappear. In the present case, if we calculate $p_\omega^{(2)}$ on the surface $\mathscr{I}^-$, then we get:

$$p_\omega^{(2)} \approx (2\pi)^{-1/2} r^{-1} \omega^{-1/2} P_\omega^- e^{-iA(r)\omega} exp\left(-i\frac{\omega}{\kappa} log\left(\frac{V_0 - V}{CD}\right)\right), \tag{103}$$

where P_ω^- is the value of the radial function at the past event horizon in the analytically continue Schwarzschild spacetime and we ignore the angular components. We can calculate $\alpha_{\omega\omega'}$ from the appropriate Fourier transformation and do the same for calculating $\beta_{\omega\omega'}$. This will provide analogous results with respect to the standard Hawking radiation. What is relevant for the moment, is the fact that the factor $e^{-iA(r)\omega}$ in eq. (103), will modify the perception of particles for an observer at $\mathscr{I}^+$ if the observers are defined with respect to the usual notion of Killing vector K^t. The exact form of the coefficients $\alpha_{\omega\omega'}$ and $\beta_{\omega\omega'}$ will depend on the specific form of the function $A(r)$. Note that the function $A(r,t)$ (it might depend on space or time), also appears implicitly inside the variable V (but not in V_0), for scales larger than the Vainshtein radius with respect to the extended notion of advanced time in the Penrose diagram. Its contribution only disappears if the observers at $\mathscr{I}^+$ and $\mathscr{I}^-$ define the Killing vectors in the direction of $T_0(r,t)$.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

I have demonstrated that the Vainshtein conditions derived in [6], contain implicitly the Galileon structure inside the $r-r$components of the conditions for the case of the spherically symmetric solution derived in [8]. In addition it has been demonstrated that there is an extended notion of the Birkhoff theorem and cosmic no-hair conjecture in dRGT massive gravity and both are related to the Vainshtein mechanism. The Vainshtein mechanism in the S-dS solution has a dual character, namely, it operates not only at scales near the sources but also at scales near the cosmological horizon where again the non-linearities of the theory should appear. Additionally, the Vainshtein mechanism is the dual version of a particle creation process for black-holes. The scale of duality being the Vainshtein radius r_V. An observer below the Vainshtein radius will observe the usual Hawking radiation emitted by the event-horizon. On the other hand, an observer at scales larger than r_V will perceive an extra-component of radiation coming from the contributions of the extra-degrees of freedom if he/she defines the time-like Killing vector in the usual way (K^t). The observer will not be able in principle to know the origin of the extra contribution. However, if the observer at such scales is able to define his Killing vector in agreement with the direction $T_0(r,t)$, then he will not perceive this extra-component. In order to isolate the effects of the extra-degrees of freedom I have done the analysis of this dual behavior for asymptotically-flat spaces (Schwarzschild). Analogous procedure would follow for S-dS and other spaces with the respective modifications. In particular for the S-dS case, it would be difficult to perceive the effects of the extra-degrees of freedom due to the strong influence of the cosmological constant at scales larger than the Vainshtein radius. The Vainshtein radius r_V is the duality scale and it behaves in an analogous way to the same scale appearing in the standard theory of GR for the S-dS solution. In such a case, the extra-component of radiation comes from the cosmological horizon itself.

Acknowledgement The author would like to thank IPMU and Shinji Muhkoyama for the hospitality during my visit, where the author had the chance of introducing part of these ideas. The author would like to thank Qing Guo Huang for the hospitality during my visit to ITP (Chinese academy of sciences), where the author also introduced part of these ideas.

[1] A. I. Vainshtein, *To the problem of non-vanishing gravitation mass*, Phys. Lett. B **39**, 393, (1972); E. Babichev and C. Deffayet, *An introduction to the Vainshtein mechanism*, Class. Quantum Grav. **30**, 184001, (2013).

[2] M.Fierz and W.Pauli, *On relativistic wave equations for particles of arbitrary spin in an electromagnetic field*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **173**, 211 (1939); W. Pauli and M. Fierz, *On Relativistic field equations of particles with arbitrary spin in an electromagnetic field*, Helv. Phys. Acta **12** 297, (1939); M. Fierz Helv. Phys. Acta **12** 3, (1939).

[3] K. Hinterbichler, *Theoretical aspects of massive gravity*, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 671 (2012).

[4] C. de Rham, *Massive gravity*, arXiv:1401.4173 [hep-th].

[5] E. Babichev and C. Deffayet, *An introduction to the Vainshtein mechanism*, Class. Quantum Grav. **30**, 184001, (2013).

[6] Ivan Arraut, *On the black-holes in alternative theories of gravity: The case of non-linear massive gravity*, arXiv:1311.0732 [gr-qc]; Ivan Arraut, *On the astrophysical scales set by the cosmological constant, black-hole thermodynamics and non-linear massive gravity*, arXiv:1305.0475 [gr-qc].

[7] Ivan Arraut, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A28** 1350019 (2013); J. Bičák and J. Podolský, *The cosmic no-hair conjecture and black-hole formation: an exact model with gravitational radiation*, *Phys. Rev.* **D 52**, 887 (1995); M. Shibata, K. Nakao, T. Nakamura and K. Maeda, *Dynamical evolution of Gravitational Waves in asymptotically de-Sitter space*, *Phys. Rev.* **D 50** 708-719 (1994).

[8] H. Kodama and I. Arraut, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. 023E02, (2014).

[9] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze and A. J. Tolley, *Resummation of massive gravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 231101, (2011).

[10] L. Berezhiani, G. Chkareuli, C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze and A. . Tolley, *On black holes in massive gravity*, Phys.Rev. **D85** (2012) 044024.

[11] N. Arkani-Hamed, H. Georgi, and M. D. Schwartz, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 305, 96, (2003); N. Arkani-Hamed and M. D. Schwartz, Phys. Rev. D 69, (2004); N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen, and H. Georgi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 4757, (2001); N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen, and H. Georgi, Phys. Lett.B 513, 232. 104001, (2001).

[12] L. Alberte, A. H. Chamseddine, and V. Mukhanov, arXiv:1008.5132, (2010); L. Alberte, A. H. Chamseddine, and V. Mukhanov, J. High Energy Phys. 04, 004, (2011).

[13] S. W. Hawking, Commun.Math.Phys. **43** (1975) 199, Erratum-ibid. **46**, 206, (1976); S. W. Hawking, Phys.Rev. **D15** 2738, (1977).

[14] S. Carroll, *Spacetime and geometry*, Addison Wesley, (2004), appendix H.

[15] Ivan Arraut, arXiv:1406.2571 [gr-qc].